

Edgefield Advertiser.

"We will cling to the Pillars of the Temple of our Liberties, and if it must fall, we will Perish amidst the Ruins."

VOLUME IX.

Edgefield Court House, S. C., June 26, 1844.

NO. 22.

EDGEFIELD ADVERTISER BY W. F. DURISOE, PROPRIETOR.

NEW TERMS.

Two-Dollars and Fifty Cents, per annum, if paid in advance—Three Dollars if not paid before the expiration of Six Months from the date of Subscription—and Four Dollars if not paid within twelve Months. Subscribers out of the State are required to pay in advance.

No subscription received for less than one year, and no paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the Publisher.

All subscriptions will be continued unless otherwise ordered before the expiration of the year.

Any person procuring five Subscribers and becoming responsible for the same, shall receive the sixth copy gratis.

Advertisements conspicuously inserted at 62½ cents per square, (12 lines, or less,) for the first insertion, and 43½ cents, for each continuance. Those published Monthly, or quarterly will be charged \$1 per square for each insertion. Advertisements not having the number of insertions marked on them, will be continued until ordered out, and charged accordingly.

All Job work done for persons living at a distance, must be paid for at the time the work is done, or the payment secured in the village.

All communications addressed to the Editor post paid, will be promptly and strictly attended to.

CONTROVERSY.

From the Western Republican. TO THE REV. LUTHER LEE.

Rev. Sir:—I addressed you a card on the 22d of last January informing you that I would pay my respects to you in due time. That time has now arrived, and that promise I am now about to fulfil. But in redeeming my pledge I may not be altogether as respectful as flattery would dictate, or as you or your admirers might possibly require. The respect however which I intended to pay you is the homage of truth; and if, in drawing your picture you dislike the portrait, you must blame the original—not the painter.

When you seceded from the Methodist Episcopal Church you had a right to publish, if you thought proper to do so, your reasons for your withdrawal; but in the exercise of your ecclesiastical rights you had no right to assail the civil institutions of the Southern States, or to trespass on the rights of others. Your attack then upon Southern Institutions was perfectly gratuitous, and your charges against Southern men were not only unjustifiable but they were false. Had you confined yourself, in assigning your reasons for withdrawing from the church, to what were your legitimate rights, perhaps no Southern man would have thought of noticing the production of your pen. But as your article contained false and scandalous charges against slave holders, representing them to be guilty of crimes "worse than horse stealing, gambling or whoredom," a moment's reflection might have taught you these charges were too gross to be listened to in silence, and too deeply affected the characters of the living and the dead to be passed over without rebuke. Pursuing the mildest course which presented itself to my mind, I, as one of those whom you had thus grossly assailed, proposed to offer you my views on the subject of domestic slavery, if you would admit my communications into your paper; in which I, in common with others, had been so violently assailed. In this way I hoped to be able to correct the errors into which you had fallen, and consequently roll away from slave holders the charges and reproaches which you had heaped upon them.

To one who admitted the possibility of his being mistaken concerning a subject which he never had an opportunity of investigating—to a heart, generous, just, and kind, who would not wantonly sport with the feelings of his fellow man, or unnecessarily assail the reputation of a neighbor—to a Christian who would not on slight evidence, much less on no evidence at all, propagate an opinion against his fellow Christian, derogatory to the Christian character—but above all to the minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ who would dread to violate any of its sacred precepts, such an overture would have been acceptable and by such would have been received with promptitude and pleasure. But how was my proposition met, and in what manner was my application treated? A brief review of your conduct in the premises shall constitute a reply.

After publishing slave holders, of whom I am one, as being guilty of the basest crimes, you refused to admit my defence into your paper, unless I would engage to have your arguments as extensively circulated among slave holders, through the medium of some southern paper, as my arguments would be circulated among abolitionists through the medium of the True Wesleyan. And was this proposition just? If you think it was, your goddess wears no bawdage over her eyes, nor does she hold in her hand an even balance. "We incline the balance as effectually by lessening the weight in one scale as by increasing it in the other." You first preferred scandalous charges against me, and then denied me the right of defending myself, (a right held sacred by Heathen, Jewish & Christian Law,) unless I would engage to comply with a condition with which you knew

I could not comply. For, 1st. I was not an editor of any paper, nor had I any interest in, or control of any paper whatever. 2nd. You must have known, or your ignorance is greater than I supposed, that the writings of abolitionists would not be admitted into Southern papers. Your condition was therefore nothing but a pitiful evasion, and so it was considered by sensible abolitionists.

When you were reproached by a brother editor with this evasion, you agreed in a paroxysm of wounded pride to publish my articles, if he would publish the whole of the controversy in his paper. It was an evil hour for you Mr. Lee, that you made this offer. Here your cunning failed you: you made it on the assumption that the gentleman to whom the offer was made, "was altogether such a one as yourself"—than which, you had never fallen into a greater mistake before. To avoid a controversy for which you were conscious you were not competent—to preserve unimpaired the reputation of being "an able disputant"—to which you knew, if you knew any thing, you could lay no just or well-founded claim—and to prevent your being held up to public scorn for your unmanly conduct; you ventured to make an offer which you believed would not be accepted, because you knew that the gentleman to whom the offer was made was an abolitionist, and knowing him to be an abolitionist, you thought he would not admit a discussion of domestic slavery into his paper.

This was the false step which you took in this matter. This false step once taken obliged you to make some show of fight, which notwithstanding all your vapourings and pretended courage soon cooled off and left not a scar or mark behind. Thanks to the Rev. Mr. Springer, for his magnanimity and impartiality: had it not been for this gentleman's "liberality," the world had never been enlightened with your lubrications, and you might have descended to your grave sustaining the character of the accomplished scholar—the expert disputant—the profound philosopher—and the able diviner.

But the best of men, Mr. Lee, are liable to fall into error, for infallibility is not an attribute of man; and for simple error an ingenious mind can readily find an excuse. But what excuse can be offered for moral obliquity in any one especially in a minister of the gospel? There is something in it so sneaking and cowardly—there is something in it so little and mean—there is something in it so unjust and unfair—there is something in it so dishonorable and shameful, that the most ingenious at forming excuses for the failures or infirmities of mankind are utterly at a loss to frame an excuse for this. Unfortunately for you sir, you seem to have yielded yourself up entirely to its influence, and to be so completely under its power, that however it may have been with you in your younger days, you cannot now speak the truth—and nothing but the truth—no, not even by accident. Take a few particulars as proof.

You labored at the outset of the controversy to prove that I was the audacious and pugnacious "challenger" of the man whose motto is, "first pure, then peaceable," when I only proposed to defend my character against the false and scandalous charges which you had previously published against slave holders. You repeatedly represented me as avoiding the point which we had set out to discuss, and yourself as putting for an opportunity to come to close quarters. You charged me with writing in "a bad temper," treating you "contemptuously," and being guilty of "abuse," notwithstanding I had explicitly proposed in my first letter that no term should be used in the controversy unbecoming the gentleman—the Christian and the minister—a proposition which you scouted with scorn. You charge me with being privy to the negroes taking away the "Anti-Slavery Manual" from the room where its owner Dr. Bennett lodged while attending the General Conference in Baltimore that might turn the affair to his disadvantage—when the fact is—the Doctor gave the book to the negroes, and I was in South Carolina at the time. You have eulogised your imbecile performances in a strain of egotism disgusting to the intelligent reader, when you ought to have left the public to judge for themselves respecting the merit of your articles and the strength of your arguments. You have alleged that the readers of the True Wesleyan are now satisfied respecting the matter at issue between us, and that this state of things has been brought about by your elaborate productions. You have excluded my letters from your paper, notwithstanding you had promised to publish them, thereby being guilty of a falsehood as well as an act of injustice. When you found you could not substantiate your charges against slave holders, you held back your communications for three months, until you would see what I would say, altho' you could have written a communication in "one day" as you tell us, you write with so much facility. When you were reproached for your conduct by the editor of the Olive Branch, you proposed new conditions to me to carry on the controversy, and you insultingly told him that by publishing the discussion in his paper he might increase his subscription list, altho' your own at the time was not near as large as his. And not to multiply proofs, you have ungenerously and falsely charged the Rev. Mr. Springer, who agreed to publish the controversy, when you would not publish it in your own paper, with combining with me to exclude you from the Recorder that

thereby I might get rid of the controversy, when you furnish proof in the same letter in which you make the charge, that your statement is false—absolutely false—in all its parts.

You complain that I have represented you as having retired from the controversial field, and express yourself at a loss to know on what grounds I could have formed this opinion. And pray sir, had I not good reason for thinking you had retired, when three months had elapsed between your letter of July 26th, and mine of October 26th, when I wrote to the editor of the Recorder to know what had become of you, or what was the cause of your silence? In what light could I consider your silence but as exhibiting proof that you had "backed out"? *Ipsa facto* your silence was proof of your retreat. When you commenced the discussion did you intend that three months should intervene between the dates of your letters? If you did, you ought to have told me so. But you did not, for you promised that a certain portion of the "True Wesleyan" should be appropriated to the controversy "every week." Did not you or your co-editors assure the public that the paper would print as fast as the disputants could write? When an apology was offered for your delay in replying to my first two letters, were we not told that now you had removed to the West the controversy would go on without any delay. In consequence of your delay did I not publish a letter in the Recorder that I would publish no more until you had replied to my two letters—that I should adhere to the motto—"Audi alteram partem." And in that letter did I not tell the editor of the Recorder, that my neighbors were under the impression that the controversy would not go on, otherwise I could have sent him more subscribers than I did? Was it not with the expectation of obtaining the controversy in due time, that so many were induced to subscribe for the paper, and do you think it was either honorable or honest thus to violate an implied contract—to falsify your promised punctuality—and cheat them out of what they were willing to receive as an equivalent for their money? If you think it was, I do not. And to prove that I would not be a party to such an infamous transaction, I wrote a second letter about your delay, and published it in the Recorder. Of these letters you have taken no notice in your complaint but proceed to censure me as if you were as free from spot as the virgin snow. I subsequently continued my letters in defence of slavery, not inscribed to you as formerly, for I considered that you had "backed out," and I did not think I was under any obligation to wait for you "to blow your own bugle" to announce your defeat.

But strongly as I condemn your manner in conducting this controversy, your faults therein are venial when compared with the principles you profess and the object you have in view. Do you ask what are these principles? and what is this object? I answer, I arrive at a knowledge of the former by a perusal of your own articles, and the articles of others published chiefly in your paper; and the object is too plainly and too frequently indicated to be misunderstood by the most stupid or superficial reader. To begin with your principles:

1. Your first principle is a professed pity for the negro slave. Against pity for the negro, I have—I can have, no objection, provided that under the mask of pity for the slave, injury is not intended or done to the master. I honor the man who feels compassion for his fellow man, whether he be black, white, or red; but in this case I suspect the profession of pity is nothing but a mask; because it *injuries* the slave instead of *benefitting* him—and, because it is a palpable violation of the golden rule by which abolitionists profess to be governed—"do unto others as you would they should do unto you."

2. From avowing pity for the slave, you proceed to fix the character of the institution of domestic slavery. You say, "slavery is a great moral evil—a sin against God—the sum of all villainies—the vilest system of oppression that ever saw the sun—worse than horse stealing, gambling or whoredom." This character you give it, not only without any authority from the scriptures, but in flat opposition to them.

3. You next fix the character of slave holders. They are "Thieves, Robbers, Pirates"—unworthy to be called "Christians" and "worse than the devil."

4. A scriptural defence of domestic slavery is termed "HORRID BLASPHEMY." "This is committed whenever any one says the Bible, or in other words, the God of the Bible sanctions slavery (except for crime) or that he did sanction it in old times which if it were not done in ignorance, would be an unpardonable sin.—What! a just God sanction the most unbounded injustice!! the sum of all villainies, the unsophisticated wickedness, the superbiological and unparalleled robbery of God and man."

"I believe that I am bound as a man, a citizen and a Christian to do all I can in the use of all means not contrary to the word of God, to effect its immediate and entire abolition."

5. You are opposed to Colonization and would not send emancipated negroes out of the United States. But you would turn three millions of negroes with all their vices and habits of idleness loose upon the white community of the South.

7. You say, "as slave holding is wrong, and as every slave has a right to himself and his liberty, slave holders are of right entitled to no compensation for their slaves."

8. "If the slave holder is entitled to compensation it must consist in prisons—stocks—thumb screws—gags—marking knives—branding irons—bloody whips—iron yokes—gall chains—and all other tortures of body and mind, for time and eternity."

9. "Let the North say with an emphasis that cannot be misunderstood, that slavery must be abolished, or the Union be dissolved. It is against this usurper (slavery) we would lend her panoply in the principles of 76 combating unto death, for the right and the true spirit of liberty."

10. "Slave holders are Thieves—Robbers—Pirates, and are deserving of a Pirate's death."

Thus, sir, have I arrived at the development of your plans, beginning with your deep hypocrisy or affected pity for the slave, and proceeding step by step to the infliction of every possible variety of "tortures of body and mind" on the slave holder. And not satisfied with what your malignity could inflict on him within the circumscribed limits of life's duration, you would follow him if you could, into the regions of the damned to inflict on him aggravated tortures in hell. To reconcile your partizans to such horrid scenes of cruelty and butchery and to induce them to co-operate with you to carry out your purposes, you have dressed up the slave holder in a fancy robe upon which you have painted "Stocks—thumb screws—gags—bloody whips—yokes—chains—marking knives—branding irons." &c., and over all have inscribed in capital letters, "WORSER THAN THE DEVIL." You have endeavored to press the mild and gentle religion of the Saviour of men into your service, by preaching up "SANCTIFICATION" for such a horrid purpose. You have scattered "fire brands, arrows and death" into churches, representing those churches as too impure for the purity of your party. You have avowed an opposition to the Constitution and Laws of the United States and rejected the decisions of her highest Judicial tribunal with disdain. You have expressed a determination to disregard the rights of others, if those rights come in conflict with your views. You aim at the dismemberment of the Union, and have hoisted the bloody flag as the signal of attack. And to give your views and principles the greater currency, with the ignorant and unsuspecting, you call yourself and your party "THE TRUE WESLEYANS." O what a misnomer—what a crime!! But you will say, perhaps, that I misrepresent you. If I do so, you have the means and the ability to correct my mistakes. Disavow the premises—disavow the conclusions if you can. There is no need for me surely to court the imagination to lead her aid, when you have expressed your object as plainly as language can express it. Great God! and is this the man who affects to be moved with pity to one class of his fellow men, whilst he is meditating the utter destruction of another?—Is this the man who assumes the character of the minister of the Prince of Peace whilst he carries the incendiary's torch in one hand and the assassin's knife in the other. Rather might I not say, you seem to have studied the character of the leader of the insurrection in St. Domingo, and to be determined to make every trait in his character your own. Nat Turner, the wholesale murderer of Virginia professed to have received instructions from God, and to have had those instructions confirmed by a miracle, to massacre the inhabitants of Southampton, but Nat Turner never said "Slave holders are worse than the Devil;" he knew them too well and had too much good sense to make such a declaration. You sir, have the honor of making this discovery, and this declaration. "Acting, however, under the same blind and fanatic zeal that Nat Turner acted under, you give us reason to conclude that you think if you were to imitate his conduct you would be doing God and his cause service. No need, then, of any flights of fancy to represent houses laid in ashes by the torch of the incendiary—to describe the flight of the young and beautiful female from the pursuit of her destroyer—to tell of the indiscriminate massacre of all classes and of all ages, from the hoary matron to the sucking infant—all these things and a thousand more which cannot be told have been transacted in St. Domingo, and in Southampton within the period of my own recollection, and all these things are to be acted over again if you and your party can only succeed in your plans.

When Benhadad king of Syria was sick, he sent Hazael an officer in his army to Elisha the prophet to enquire if he should recover. When Hazael came, the prophet looked steadfastly in his face—blushed—and wept. Hazael said, "why weepeth my lord?" The prophet answered, "because I know the evil thou wilt do unto the children of Israel, their strong holds wilt thou set on fire—and their young men wilt thou slay with the sword—and wilt dash their children—and rip up their women with child." And Hazael said, "But what! is thy servant a dog that he should do this great thing?" To which the prophet mildly replied—"The Lord hath shewed me that thou wilt be king over Syria." As if he had said I see you are a proud man and love to rule—you pride will make you an unjust man—your injustice will make you cruel—and your cruelty, for your own safety, will make you a monster. Accordingly after he returned to his master his first word was a lie—and his first act was the hastening of the death of his Sovereign by suffocation. And on he went from crime to crime, till, notwithstanding the horror he had just be-

fore manifested at the bare recital of the crimes which Elisha told him he would commit, he perpetrated every crime which had been foretold by the prophet without any compunction and without any remorse.

I offer no apology, Mr. Lee, for the frankness or severity of my remarks: for it is no time to be cringing or apologizing when my house is in a blaze over my head, and the murderer's dagger is pointed at my heart. My only concern is, lest thousands who are abolitionists should apply to themselves the remarks which I have intended in this letter, *exclusively for you and your party*. I distinguish between *anti-slavery* men, and *abolitionists* like yourself; for although the former believe slavery to be an evil, they would not be accessory to an injury to slaveholders, much less would they encourage by their writings the massacre of the master for the sake of the slave. This it appears to me is not the case with you and others of your stamp, for the whole tenor of your writings is to bring about such a result. If, however, the day should ever unfortunately arrive when the aid of *anti-slavery* men will be wanted to quiet a Southern insurrection, I have no doubt but what has taken place in Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Alton, Boston, Utica and other places that the North, the East, and the West, would pour in their tens of thousands, to the aid of the South, under the deep conviction of the truth of the sentiment expressed by an eminent Jurist—"that man's first duty is to his God—his next to his country."

Will the "Albany Patriot," and the "Olive Branch" please insert this letter.
A. McCAINE.
Lott's, Edgefield Dist., S. C., May 13, 1844.

MISCELLANEOUS.

GEN. CASS'S SPEECH IN FAVOR OF THE NOMINATION.

The Democratic Association of Detroit, met on the 3d inst., to respond to the national nominations. It was a gallant polk at Whiggery. Gen. Lewis Cass, the soldier and statesman, who had a strong support on the second day of the Baltimore Convention, appeared in the midst of his fellow citizens, and addressed them. He heartily responded to the nomination of Polk and Dallas. We here extract a sentence from his speech:

"Gen. Cass said he had come here this evening to take part in the proceedings, to express his hearty concurrence in the nomination made by the Baltimore Democratic Convention, and to announce his determination faithfully to support it. He said the crisis through which the Democratic party had just passed, had served but the better to prove the integrity of its principles, and the internal strength of its cause. After many differences of opinion, differences however, about men, and not about measures, the choice of the Convention had unanimously fallen upon a man irreproachable in private life, and who in various public stations, had given proof of great firmness and ability, of incorruptible integrity, and of a sincere devotion to those principles, which the Democratic party deem essential to the prosperity of our country, and the perpetuation of her free institutions. I know him well, said General Cass, and I know he will fulfil the expectations of his friends, and fully justify the confidence of the party. Nothing is now wanting to ensure success, but united exertion, and that we must and will have. Let us put behind us the divisions and preferences of the past, and join in one common effort, to promote the triumph of our cause. Victory is in our power, and let us attain it. Let every one feel and fulfil his duty. I am so persuaded that such will be the general sentiment and action of the party, that I confidently predict that James K. Polk will be the next President of the United States, and if he is, I know he will follow in the footsteps of Washington, of Jefferson, of Madison, and of Jackson."

After the adjournment of the Meeting, the company gathered in front of the dwelling of General Cass, and gave three hearty cheers. The General came to the door and thanked them kindly, and told them to do their duty to the democracy and their country by electing James K. Polk, their next President.—The company with one voice replied that they would, and they will.

Silas Wright.—This is an extraordinary man, apart from politics. He has a small farm near Ogdensburg, N. Y. to which he went some ten years ago, leaving his profession, which brought him in thousands per annum, for about \$300 a year, which is earned by the sweat of his brow. When Martin Van Buren drove up to his house, some years ago, on particular political business, he found Mr. Wright in a linsey woolsey dress, piling stones into heaps to save the scythe of the mowers, when the grass was ready for harvest, one of the most laborious proceedings that ever man went at; we have tried it, and speak knowingly. He has been offered the judgeship, secretaryship, the nomination for President at the late convention at Baltimore, and when nominated for the vice presidency declined it peremptorily. Such is the character, and some of the prominent acts of Silas Wright senator from New York; and people will be at a loss to know what has caused him to take up farming and content himself with being senator only.—Cincinnati Commercial.

The Whigs are singularly unfortunate in their attempts to lessen the claims of Col. Polk to the suffrages and confidence of the

American people. They now take the ground that his unpopularity in Tennessee twice defeated him for the office of Governor. It is very true that he was twice defeated; but do not the people of the United States know the causes that led to his defeat? We shall ourselves revert to them hereafter; for we have in hand sufficient proofs to expose the means then resorted to. Our purpose at present, in noticing the defeat of Polk twice for the office of Governor, as an allegation by the Whigs of incompetency, is to compare the position occupied by both candidates for the presidency, as regards defeat for office. If defeat is an objection to Col. Polk, should not the same objection be alleged to Mr. Clay in a more forcible manner? Col. Polk was twice defeated for the office of Governor. How many times was Mr. Clay defeated for the office of President. Was not Mr. Clay defeated in 1824, when he received but 37 out of 261 electoral votes? Was he not virtually defeated in 1828, when Mr. John Q. Adams received 83 and Gen. Jackson 178 electoral votes? Was he not defeated individually, in 1832, when he received but 49 out of 286 electoral votes? And in 1840, was he not defeated in the Whig convention, as being less available than Gen. Harrison? Thus was Mr. Clay defeated in his aspirations to the highest office of the country, not two times but four times; and yet the Whigs allege as an objection to the election of Col. Polk that he has been twice defeated for the office of Governor of Tennessee. We shall continue the subject in subsequent numbers of this paper.—Augusta Constitutionalist.

Murder and Lynch Law in Mississippi.—The Natchez Courier of the 4th inst., contains the particulars of an atrocious murder in Jefferson county, Miss.; with the summary execution of two of the murderers. It seems that a Mr. Wm. Boyd, living near Torry's store, was about to correct one of his negroes for some offence, when the fellow turned upon his master and was about to overpower him.—The latter called upon two negro women, who were at work in the same field for assistance, but instead of helping they fell upon him, with their bows and soon put him to death. The three negroes secreted the body of Mr. B. in a brush heap; but in two days time it beginning to smell they removed it to a log pile, set every thing on fire, and burnt the body to ashes. The negroes, suspecting that the absence of their master would soon be known, assuming boldness enough to tell some of his neighbors that Mr. B. had been absent for some days—that his horse had come up saddled, bridled, &c., and that they suspected foul play.

A search was immediately instituted by the neighbors, and after some time they came upon the spot in the field where the combat had taken place between Mr. Boyd and the negroes. One thing led to another until the negroes were all arrested, when they acknowledged their crime as stated above. The excitement among the people assembled was very great. About one hundred persons were collected, on Friday last, 31st ult., one week from the day of the murder. They appointed a jury of eighteen men to decide what should be done with the negroes. Fourteen of the jury were for hanging the negroes and four against it. Two of the negroes, the man and one of the women, were hung instantly. The other woman being pregnant was spared.

An Anecdote.—On Wednesday after the nomination of Mr. Polk, Mr. McCa, a delegate from Ohio, and present Clerk to the House of Representatives, arose, with a very grave air, and charged upon the convention a fraud—saying an error fraud.—(Members began to pick up their ears with astonishment.) Yes he told them, a fraud, because the Whigs had wasted at least \$50,000 in printing all the old humbugs of the 20,000 Standing Army—and negro evidence—and the gold spoons, &c., &c., which were now prepared for immediate distribution—and here had this Convention come forward to cheat them of their valuable property, by making it lumber and waste paper "leather and prunella" upon their hands. Was this right? Was it treating the Convention decently and fairly? Lt. Governor Dickinson of New York, (a gentleman of much humor and good sense,) immediately rose, and gravely moved, that the Whigs be reimbursed out of the surplus profits of the Banks of the United States.

Attempted Suicide of the Robber.—A man named John Daily who was arrested in this city yesterday evening, for having stolen Mr. McKee's carpet bag from the City Hotel at Albany, containing nearly \$10,000, the greater part of which has been recovered, was this morning found lying in his cell with his throat cut, and literally covered with blood. During the night he had cut his throat with a lance, almost completely across, but without severing the arteries or windpipe.

He had also bled himself in the arms and wrists, ankles and thighs, and when discovered this morning he was apparently in the last stage of exhaustion. A Surgeon, however, who was immediately sent for, and bound up his wounds, considers him likely to recover. It is believed here, that Daily is not his real name, and that he has been on a former occasion, accused with a similar offence.—N. Y. Jour. Com.

A Legion of Criminals.—There were confined in the New York Sing Sing Prison, on the 1st instant, 856 males and 72 females, making a total of 928 persons.